REMARKS

This communication is in response to the Office Action mailed June 4, 2007. The Office Action first reports that claims 20-27 were rejected as being indefinite. With this amendment, these claims have been cancelled.

Before addressing the substantive rejections contained in the Office Action, it was reported that claims 28 and 29 were allowed and that claims 2, 15-19 and 36-40 would be allowable if written in independent form. With this Amendment, applicants have rewritten claims 2 and 36 in independent form to include all the features of claims 1 and 30, respectively. Accordingly, it is believed that claims 2, 15-20, and 36-40 are in condition for allowance.

It should also be noted that each of the computer readable medium claims have been amended to recite "computer readable storage medium claims", which is believed to be a preferred form for the office. In addition each of the independent computer readable storage medium claims have been amended to include instructions comprising a text analyzer, which again is believed to be preferred for such claims. Entry of these amendments is respectfully requested.

With this amendment, new claims 41-46 have been added. Each of these claims depend directly or indirectly from independent claim 2. It is believed that each of these claims are separately patentable when the features recited therein are combined with the features of independent claim 2 and any intervening claims.

Claims 1, 3-14 were rejected as being anticipated by Penteroudakis et al. With this amendment, claim 1 has been amended to include features similar to that previously recited in claims 11 and 13. In particular, claim 1 now recites in part that the lexicon includes "a third field comprising lemma delta

information associated with the entered word, wherein the lemma delta information comprises transformation information associated with the entered word, the transformation information comprising an op code and an argument value, wherein the op code is indicative of an operation to perform upon the entered word based on the argument value in order to convert the entered word into a second word." The Office Action reports that Penteroudakis et al. anticipated claim 11 and 13, citing col. 14, lines 6-24 (with respect to claim 11) and col. 11, lines 12-37 (with respect to claim 13), both of which are provided below:

col. 14, lines 6-24

FIG. **32** displays a flow diagram for the lexical subroutine that finds all entries in an electronic dictionary that contain records that represent possible parts of speech and definitions of an input word passed to the subroutine as the
10 argument "ilemma." In step **3201**, the lexical subroutine initializes the variable "record_list" to be empty, and assigns to the variable "next_lemma" the value in ilemma. In step **3202**, the lexical subroutine calls the lookup routine displayed in FIG. **33** to find an entry from the electronic
15 dictionary with a key corresponding to ilemma. If no entry is found at step **3203**, the lexical subroutine then determines whether the dictionary is of type FSM. If it is, then the lexical subroutine returns an empty record_list in step **3205**. If the dictionary is not of type FSM, the lexical subroutine
20 applies morphological rules to ilemma to produce another lemma in step **3206**. If a new lemma is generated in step **3706**, then control loops back to the beginning of the routine; otherwise, the lexical subroutine returns record_list at step **3205**.

col. 11, lines 6-24

A dictionary may be constructed so that, if an input word is initially matched to a key in the dictionary, it is guaranteed that no morphological rules need to be applied to the input word to find other possible forms which might correspond to the input word. For example, consider looking up the input word "building" from the input sentence "I am building a bridge." In this case, "building" is an inflected form of the uninflected form "build." It might be the case that, in the entry corresponding to the key "building," only records representing the uninflected form "building" are found, or, in other words, records representing the noun "building." In order to find the record corresponding to the present singular verb "building," the DLC would, in this case, apply a morphological rule to "building" to produce the verb "to build" and then look up "build." This type of dictionary is known as an under-specified dictionary with respect to homographic word forms ("USH dictionary"). The USH dictionary entry for the noun "building" is displayed in FIG. **28**. The only attribute/value pair, **2801**, in the entry with key "building" **2802** corresponds to the noun "building." A fully-specified dictionary with respect to homographic word forms ("FSH dictionary") guarantees that the entry with key "building" includes an attribute/value pair corresponding to the verb "to build." The FSH dictionary entry for the key "building" is shown in FIG. **29**. If a normalized input word is matched to a key in a FSH dictionary, no morphological rules need be applied to the input word to find all relevant records.

It is respectfully submitted that nowhere in these citations is an operation code (op code) and an argument described or suggested as recited in claim 1. At col. 11, line 28 an "attribute/value pair, 2801" is mentioned, but upon review of Fig. 28 it is clear that what is shown is not an indication of an operation to perform given an argument to change one word into another word. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is in condition for allowance, while dependent claims therefrom are separately patentable and are also in condition for allowance.

The foregoing remarks are intended to assist the Office in examining the application and in the course of explanation may employ shortened or more specific or variant descriptions of some of the claim language. Such descriptions are not intended to limit the scope of the claims; the actual claim language should be considered in each case. Furthermore, the remarks are not to be considered exhaustive of the facets of the invention which are rendered patentable, being only examples of certain advantageous features and differences, which applicant's attorney chooses to mention at this time. For the foregoing reasons, applicant reserves the right to submit additional evidence showing the distinction between applicant's invention to be unobvious in view of the prior art.

Furthermore, in commenting on the references and in order to facilitate a better understanding of the differences that are expressed in the claims, certain details of distinction between the same and the present invention have been mentioned, even though such differences do not appear in all of the claims. It is not intended by mentioning any such unclaimed distinctions to create any implied limitations in the claims.

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that the application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the

application and allowance of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

An extension of time is hereby requested for responding to the Office Action. A charge authorization for the extension of time fee is included herewith.

The Director is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTMAN, CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.

By: _____
    Steven M. Koehler, Reg. No. 36,188
    900 Second Avenue South, Suite 1400
    Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402
    Phone: (612) 334-3222 Fax: (612) 334-3312

SMK:bms